

Unknown

From: Gordon Robertson [dger@uottawa.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2012 3:10 PM
To: nali065@uottawa.ca
Subject: RE: URGENT

I don't think it is necessary to sit down with the examiners. Your thesis is fine.

From: nali065@uottawa.ca [nali065@uottawa.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2012 1:53 PM
To: Gordon Robertson; Gholamreza Rouhi
Subject: URGENT

Dr. Robertson and Dr. Rouhi:

Below is the response I am thinking of sending to Dr. Hastings. However, prior to sending this out I need your input. Please let me know how you recommend we proceed. Please change this response in any way you see best.
Look forward to hearing from you soon.

Dr. Robertson, I do not know if you have email access but please let me know as soon as you get this as I would like to provide Dr. Hastings a response by July 9th latest or sooner.

All changes to the review sheet is complete and ready to go.

Many thanks and best regards, Nicholas

Dear Dr. Hastings:

Many thanks for help with this matter. Please find attached the revised thesis review sheet that attempted to primarily tone down or completely remove all "unnecessarily provocative" responses as requested. These amendments were vetted by both my supervisor and co-supervisor.

Unfortunately, the deadline of July 9th 2012 stipulated below does not afford much time for me to sit with all four examiners, go over the review sheet point by point, ensure the concerns raised were satisfactorily addressed, and then make any further amendments, if any, to the thesis. As a result, I kindly ask for an extension to July 30 2012. If this not possible, kindly send the revised thesis review sheet attached, the accompanying attachments, as well as, the revised thesis to all examiners.

I remain very grateful for your guidance and help at this time Dr. Hastings and look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Ali

----- Original Message -----
Subject: RE: N. Ali, #5033260 - submission of revised thesis
From: "DEANGRAD" <deangrad@uottawa.ca>
Date: Tue, 3 July, 2012 4:12 pm
To: "'nali065@uottawa.ca'" <nali065@uottawa.ca>

Dear Mr. Ali,

Please find (below) the answers to your questions - I have copied parts of your email (in italics) in order to simplify the presentation.

In summary, I would really appreciate your guidance and help in answering the following requests and questions:

(a) As I am at a critical juncture in my graduate studies, can you kindly

offer just one (1) additional week to complete the revisions to the review sheet? YES - you may have until July 9th, 2012

(b) May I have your approval to initiate dialogue with each examiner? YES - it is very common for students to consult with examiners at this stage

(c) If possible, I would like to consider seeking an additional examiner

to independently review my work. Can I do this, and further do you recommend doing so? NO, it is not possible to add an additional examiner at this point, nor would I recommend doing so.

(d) Lastly, I could find no information from the School of Human Kinetics

website nor the FGPS website on options for recourse and appeal available to a student at the thesis resubmission stage, and possibly facing failure. Please advise what University of Ottawa policies and procedures on recourse and appeal applies in this situation? + (e) Moreover, what recourses are possible if the examiners come back and

give a "fail" that denies me a thesis defense, and FGPS advises that "I must withdraw from the program"?

At this point, you must go through the basic steps in the process: that is, you must resubmit your thesis, have it evaluated by the examiners and wait for the results. If the results are positive (all 1s or 2s, the thesis will proceed to defense. If the results are negative, then the decision will revert to me as Dean of the FGPS. My decision can be appealed, first to the Executive Committee of the FGPS and, if you wish, to the Appeals Committee of Senate.

I hope this answers your questions and provides you the information you require. I wish you the best of luck with the final stages of your thesis.

Sincerely,

Ross Hastings

Doyen | Dean

Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales |

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

deangrad@uOttawa.ca

Téléphone / Telephone : (613) 562-5800 poste/extension 1234

-----Original Message-----

From: nali065@uottawa.ca [mailto:nali065@uottawa.ca]

Sent: 24 juin 2012 12:29

To: DEANGRAD

Cc: 'nali065@uottawa.ca'; Gordon Robertson; 'grouhi@uottawa.ca'; Heidi Sveistrup; Sonia Letourneau; Christine Bourbonnais-Hendley

Subject: Re: N. Ali, #5033260 - submission of revised thesis

Dear Dr. Hastings:

Thank you for your timely expression of concern and your offer to help.

Your email has raised serious alarms and concerns for me. I apologize in advance for this long email. I am in agreement with your recommendations and I am very keen, as I was from the beginning, to remove or mitigate all risks associated with my present situation. For over four years I have dedicated all of my energy, knowledge, passion, time, and money to my PhD education at the University of Ottawa. As a result, please understand it was very difficult and hurtful to have received comments that were unconstructive, subjective and personal by some of my thesis examiners.

As you recommended, I have removed my supervisor's and co-supervisor's names from the thesis review sheet. Furthermore, I am currently toning down my comments in the thesis review sheet (see Attachment of work done to date), but still feel that more is necessary. In the case of some examiners, I cannot conceivably see that amendments in tone will assist in changing the fail to a pass; therefore, I am requesting that your excellent recommendation from the meeting on February 28, 2012 with my supervisor, which never came to fruition, be explored.

Following receipt of your letter regarding the examiners' report, I quickly acted to undertake the following steps within the time given: seek guidance from my supervisor and co-supervisor, creation of the review sheet aimed at answering all comments from all examiners. Amendments where needed were implemented within the revised thesis. Upon completion of each examiner's comments, the thesis review sheet along with revised thesis was sent to my supervisor and co-supervisor for review, amendments and approval. Prior to your meeting with my supervisor, I also implored my supervisor for me to sit down with Dr. Sveistrup, you and the respected examiners. While this did not happen, once my supervisor met with you my anxiety lessened regarding the matter. Your recommendation then was that my supervisor meets with each examiner to ensure all comments within the review sheet were

satisfactorily answered. I tried to ensure this go forth, as it was and is very crucial for my success, but this never happened. Presently, I am requesting -nor does my supervisor object- to correct this by properly enacting your recommendation of speaking with each examiner to ensure all comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

Finally, certain facts that make my situation even more risky:

1. My thesis is an article style thesis consisting of five manuscripts.

All manuscripts have been authored by renowned researchers including my supervisor and Dr. John Rasmussen. Two of these papers have been published and three are under review.

2. From the initial formation of my thesis advisory committee, which happened at the thesis proposal stage, until now, I have had no discussions with any of my thesis committee members on the content of my thesis.

3. All examiners already have an earlier version of the thesis review sheet provided by my supervisor.

4. Initially, examiner D refused to review my thesis by dropping out of my thesis committee, which the School of Human Kinetics was only made aware upon sending him my thesis. Over the course of searching for a replacement, Examiner D agreed to review my thesis. When asked why Examiner D refused and then agreed, disparate answers were provided, which raised grave concerns for me.

5. Examiner A was added at the very end and during thesis preparation for submission. I was against Examiner A being a part of my thesis committee.

In summary, I would really appreciate your guidance and help in answering the following requests and questions:

(a) As I am at a critical juncture in my graduate studies, can you kindly

offer just one (1) additional week to complete the revisions to the review sheet?

(b) May I have your approval to initiate dialogue with each examiner?

(c) If possible, I would like to consider seeking an additional examiner

to independently review my work. Can I do this, and further do you recommend doing so?

(d) Lastly, I could find no information from the School of Human Kinetics

website nor the FGPS website on options for recourse and appeal available to a student at the thesis resubmission stage, and possibly facing failure. Please advise what University of Ottawa policies and procedures on recourse and appeal applies in this situation?

(e) Moreover, what recourses are possible if the examiners come back and

give a "fail" that denies me a thesis defense, and FGPS advises that "I must withdraw from the program"?

I appreciate your support Dr. Hastings, furthermore I seek your guidance and help in allowing for a successful outcome to this terribly stressful situation.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Ali
PhD Candidate

> Dear Mr. Ali,

>

> I am writing in regards to your recent submission of the revised
> version of your Ph.D. thesis and of the accompanying "Thesis review sheets"
> addressed to Examiners A, B, C and D - my purpose is to make sure you
> and your advisors fully understand the situation you are facing and
> the potential risks you are running.

>

> I wish to address three points in particular:

>

>

> 1. This is your thesis, not that of your advisors - as a result, you
> are the sole person being who should be listed as the author of the

> "Thesis review sheets". The thesis and the Thesis review sheets will
> not be submitted to the evaluators until the names of your advisors
> are removed as co-authors of the "Thesis review sheets".
>
> 2. The results of the first evaluation indicated that the examiners
> had major concerns about the work that was presented: one examiner
> gave a rating of 2 (revisions required after the defense), two
> examiners gave a rating of 3 (must be revised before it can be
> reconsidered), and one examiner gave a rating of 4 (fails to meet the
> standards required for the degree). I assume that you have attempted
> to address the concerns identified by the examiners in the revised
> version of your thesis.
> However, I have some concerns about the content of the "Thesis review
> sheets" that you have submitted with your revised thesis - in my view,
> they are unnecessarily provocative, and run the risk of being
> perceived as calling into question the professionalism and integrity
> of
the examiners.
>
> 3. I remind you that this is the second evaluation of your thesis -
> if it is not accepted for defense, you will have to withdraw from the
> program. In that context, and given the concerns expressed in points 1
> and
> 2 (above), I would ask both you, Dr. Robertson and Dr. Rouhi to
> confirm to me in writing that you are aware of my concerns and of the
> risk you are running, and that you nevertheless wish me to proceed to
> distribute the thesis and the related documentation to the examiners.
> I will wait to hear from you before proceeding.
>
> Please contact my office if you have any questions.
>
> Ross Hastings
> Doyen | Dean
> Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales | Faculty of Graduate
> and Postdoctoral Studies Pavillon Hagen Hall (209) Université d'Ottawa

> | University of Ottawa Ottawa ON Canada K1N 6N5

>

> deangrad@uOttawa.ca<mailto:deangrad@uOttawa.ca<mailto:deangrad@uOttawa
> .ca%3cmmailto:deangrad@uOttawa.ca>>

> Téléphone / Telephone : (613) 562-5800 poste/extension 1234

> Télécopieur / Fax: (613) 562-5730

> <http://www.uOttawa.ca><<http://www.uottawa.ca/><<http://www.uOttawa.ca%3ch>
> [ttp://www.uottawa.ca/](http://www.uottawa.ca/)>>

>

>

>